Critical & Analytical Essays

Śrī Caitanya Deva as a Connoisseur of Sāhitya Śāstra: A Critical Study of the Pañcadoṣa and Pañcālaṅkāra in Keśava Bhaṭṭa's Verse

Dr. Rakesh Das [1] **& Sri Prolay Nandi**[2]

[1] Associate Professor, Department of Sanskrit and Philosophy, Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal, Bharat. Orchid ID 0009-0009-7101-0226; rakdas@gmail.com

[2] Research Scholar Department of Sanskrit and Philosophy, Ramakrishna Mission Vivekananda Educational and Research Institute, Belur Math, Howrah, West Bengal, Bharat. prolay.nandi.vedvid@gmail.com

Check for updates

Edited By: Amritanath Bhattacharya

Citation: Das, Rakesh, and Prolay Nandi. " Śrī Caitanya Deva as a Connoisseur of Sāhitya Śāstra: A Critical Study of the Pañcadoṣa and Pañcālaṅkāra in Keśava Bhaṭṭa's Verse." Poorvam International Journal of Creative Arts and Cultural Expressions, vol. 2, no. 1, June. 2026, pp. 09-41, Doi: 10.63752/pijcace.0201S01

Copyright:

© 2025 Rakesh Das & Prolay Nandi. Published by Dhvani Publication in Poorvam International Journal of Creative Arts and Cultural Expressions. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits unrestricted non-commercial use and distribution, provided the original work is properly cited and no derivatives are made.

Abstract:

Śrī Caitanya Deva, revered in Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava tradition as the combined manifestation of Śrī Kṛṣṇa and Śrī Rādhā, is widely recognized for his philosophical contributions and devotional movement. This article highlights a less-explored dimension of his genius–his profound mastery of *Sāhitya Śāstra* (literary theory and poetics)–through a critical examination of his scholarly encounter with the Kashmirian digvijayī scholar Keśava Bhaṭṭa, as detailed in Śrī Caitanya Caritāmṛta and Caitanya Bhāgavata. During their meeting on the banks of the Gaṅgā, Keśava Bhaṭṭa, renowned for his extemporaneous composition (*ghaṭikāśataka*), composed one hundred verses glorifying the Gaṅgā. Caitanya selected one verse in the *Śikhariṇī* metre and subjected it to a masterful critique based on the principles of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*. He identified five poetic defects (*pañcadoṣa*)–two instances of avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa, viruddhamatikṛt, bhagnakrama, and punarātta–and five literary ornaments (*pañcālaṅkāra*): *anuprāsa* (alliteration), *punaruktavadābhāsa*, *upamā* (simile), *virodhābhāsa* (semblance of contradiction), and *anumāna* (inference). The article provides detailed definitions and textual analysis of each doṣa and alaṅkāra, drawing from authoritative texts like Sāhityadarpaṇa and Alaṅkārakaustubha. It demonstrates how Caitanya's analysis reveals both the aesthetic strengths and compositional flaws of the verse, underscoring the primacy of doṣa-guṇa vicāra (critical evaluation of defects and merits) in poetic composition. This episode not only affirms Caitanya's extraordinary erudition in Sanskrit poetics alongside grammar and philosophy but also

exemplifies his humility and spiritual magnetism, which ultimately led to Keśava Bhaṭṭa's surrender. The study thus illuminates Caitanya's multifaceted brilliance as a consummate connoisseur of Sāhitya Śāstra.

Keywords: Caitanya, Gaudiya Philosophy, Gaudiya Poetics, Caitanya-caritamṛta

1. Introduction

In Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava doctrine, Śrī Caitanya Deva is regarded as an avatāra of Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa, who descended in the *Kali Yuga* bearing the spiritual disposition (*bhāva*) and complexion (*kānti*) of Rādhā[i]. In this connection, Gosvāmī Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja, in his celebrated work *Śrī Śrī Caitanya Caritāmṛta*, has cited two verses from the *Viṣṇusahasranāma Stotra* from the *Mahābhārata*[ii]. While there remains scholarly disagreement regarding the question of Caitanya Deva's *avatāra* status, his extraordinary erudition in Sanskrit scriptural literature has been acknowledged without dissent across traditions. References to his scriptural discussions with various *śāstrakāras*–learned authorities on sacred texts–are found in numerous biographical works dedicated to his life. Śrī Caitanya Deva was, by all accounts, among the most distinguished scholars of his time, even though he did not undertake the customary digvijaya–the triumphal tour of intellectual conquest prevalent among learned men of that period. Nevertheless, accounts of his doctrinal and exegetical exchanges with various scholars on different occasions are attested in multiple sources.

Although references to various compositions attributed to Caitanya Deva are found in the available sources, only a single poem of his has survived to the present day. Nonetheless, that single poem containing 8 verses shows not only his deep erudition of Philosophy and rhetoric but also his poetic brilliance. An intense study of his poem *Śikṣāṣṭakam* allows us to form a partial estimate of his remarkable scholarly depth. Śrī Caitanya Deva is widely recognized as the propounder of the *Acintyabhedābheda* views of the *Vedānta* and is held in particular esteem within philosophical circles. However, the concern of the present article is not his philosophical contributions but rather his command over *Sāhitya Śāstra*. He was notably proficient in the discipline of *Sāhitya Śāstra* alongside his mastery of grammar (*Vyākaraṇa*) and philosophy (*Darśana*). This dimension of his intellectual formation comes to the

fore in the account of his scholarly dialogue with Keśava Bhaṭṭa of Kashmir.

A detailed account of this episode is found in verses 26 through 108 of the sixteenth chapter of the *Ādi Līlā* of *Śrī Śrī Caitanya Caritāmṛta*. In addition to this, Śrīla Vṛndāvana Dāsa has also provided an elaborate description of the same episode in his *magnum opus Caitanya Bhāgavata*[iii]. He records that Śrī Caitanya Deva was endowed with extraordinary intellectual gifts from his very childhood[iv], and that his reputation for profound scholarship had spread widely among learned communities far and near. Whenever he was present in any scholarly assembly, all those gathered would accept his views without contest or deliberation. It was as though, by some ineffable power of *māyā*, everyone present remained wholly under his influence. Without his own bestowal of grace, no one possessed the capacity to comprehend him in any adequate or meaningful sense[v]. In this manner, he presided as the central figure–the *madhyamaṇi*–centerpiece–in every assembly he attended.

In his *catuṣpāṭhī*–the traditional residential school of learning–Śrī Caitanya primarily taught the *Kalāpa Vyākaraṇa*[vi]. One evening during the bright fortnight of the lunar month, Śrī Caitanya was seated on the bank of the *Gaṅgā*, engaged in some discussion with his disciples, when the *digvijayī*–the triumphant scholar–Keśava Bhaṭṭa arrived at that place. Many scholars commonly refer to Grammar as *bālaśāstra*, a subject for the children, as it is an elementary discipline, on the grounds that its study constitutes the foundational preparation necessary before one proceeds to the study of other branches of learning. Within the domain of grammar itself, the *Kalāpa* system is considered comparatively easier. Keśava Bhaṭṭa had come to know of this through common report. He was of the considered opinion that only one who is proficient across multiple branches of *śāstra* may rightly be regarded as a true *paṇḍita*; the possession of knowledge in merely one or two disciplines does not, in his view, warrant the conferral of such a distinction. For this reason, Keśava Bhaṭṭa did not regard Nimāi Paṇḍita, the teacher of grammar, as anything more than an ordinary teacher of a *catuṣpāṭhī*. It was in this frame of mind that, upon observing Śrī Caitanya engaged in a discussion of *Kalāpa* with his disciples, Keśava Bhaṭṭa remarked in a tone of evident condescension that one who teaches so elementary a text as the *Kalāpa* grammar could scarcely be accorded the title of *paṇḍita*[vii].

Remaining entirely unperturbed by Keśava Bhaṭṭa's dismissive remark, Śrī Caitanya outwardly appeared to concede his point and expressed, with studied humility, an acknowledgement of his own limited learning. He then proceeded to lavish considerable praise upon Keśava Bhaṭṭa and requested him to compose verses in glorification of the greatness of the Gaṅgā. Keśava Bhaṭṭa was a *ghaṭikāśataka*– one renowned for the extraordinary feat of composing a hundred verses extemporaneously within a single *ghaṭikā*, that is, within the span of twenty-four minutes[viii]–and true to his reputation, he proceeded to compose a hundred verses in rapid succession, with the swiftness of a storm.

From among those hundred verses, Caitanya Deva selected one and asked Keśava Bhaṭṭa to elaborate upon its meaning. The verse in question reads as follow–

> *Mahattvaṃ Gaṅgāyāḥ satatam idam ābhāti nitarāṃ*
> *yad eṣā Śrī-Viṣṇoścaraṇa-kamalottpatti-subhagā.*
> *Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīr iva sura-narair arcya-caraṇā*
> *Bhavānī-bhartur yā śirasi vibhavaty adbhuta-guṇā.*
>
> The greatness of the Gaṅgā shines forth eternally and with particular brilliance, for she is most blessed in having her origin at the lotus feet of Śrī Viṣṇu. Venerated at her feet by deities and men alike, as though she were a second Śrī Lakṣmī, she of wondrous attributes rests in glory upon the husband of the lord of Bhavānī–that is, Śiva himself.

Keśava Bhaṭṭa was struck with astonishment upon hearing the flawless recitation[ix] of a verse selected from the hundred compositions he had just extemporaneously produced[x]. He proceeded to expound upon the meaning of the verse in the following manner–the glory of the Gaṅgā shines forth perpetually and without doubt: she who is supremely blessed by virtue of her origin at the lotus feet of Śrī Viṣṇu; she at whose feet both deities and mortals offer their veneration, even as they would at the feet of a second Lakṣmī; she who, resting upon the head of Bhavānī's lord–that is, Mahādeva himself–has come to be endowed with qualities of wondrous excellence. Such is the Gaṅgā, whose greatness remains resplendent and undiminished at all times.

Having listened to the exposition of the verse's meaning, Caitanya Deva requested Keśava Bhaṭṭa to undertake a critical evaluation of the poetic merits and defects (*guṇa* and *doṣa*) present

within it, in accordance with the principles of A*laṅkāraśāstra* (rhetoric and poetics). Keśava Bhaṭṭa replied that his verse was entirely free from even the slightest trace of any poetic defect, and that it contained, on the contrary, several figures of speech (*alaṅkāra*) such as *upamā* (simile), *anuprāsa* (alliteration), along with certain recognised *guṇa*s. It was in this very context that he directed a pointed remark at Śrī Caitanya, asserting that one who confines himself exclusively to the study of grammar could by no means be capable of evaluating the merits and defects of a poetic composition in accordance with the canons of A*laṅkāraśāstra*. He further maintained that the verse in question represented the very essence of all poetic composition, and that any attempt to identify defects within it was therefore wholly without justification. In response to this, Caitanya calmly observed that the said verse contained five instances of poetic defect (*doṣa*) and five instances of *alaṅkāra*s[xi], and proceeded to enumerate them in due order.

2. The Five Defects (*Pañcadoṣa*)

In the course of his critical analysis of the verse composed by Keśava Bhaṭṭa, Caitanya identified five distinct instances of poetic defect. In the technical vocabulary of S*āhityaśāstra*, a defect (*doṣa*) is defined as anything that creates hurdles in relishing (*āsvādana*) the *rasa*[xii]. Of the five defects identified in the said verse, two instances involve the defect known as *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*, while the remaining three consist respectively of *viruddhamatikṛt*, *bhagnakrama*, and *punarātta*[xiii]. An attempt will be made in the following discussion to examine the defining characteristics (*lakṣaṇa*) of each of these defects in the light of S*āhityaśāstra*, and to trace their occurrence within the verse in detail.

The verse has been composed in the *Śikhariṇī*[xiv] metre. Within this verse, the expressions *"Mahattvaṃ Gaṅgāyāḥ idam"* and *"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīḥ"* have been identified as bearing the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*. The compound *"Bhavānī-bhartuḥ"* has been found to carry the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt*; the construction *"yad eṣā"* and related expressions have been noted as instances of *bhagnakrama*; and the phrase *"adbhuta-guṇā"* and its contextual usage have been identified as exhibiting the defect of *punarātta*.

2.1 The Defect of *Avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*

The first defect that Caitanya Deva identified in the course of his analysis of the verse composed by the *digvijayī* scholar Keśava Bhaṭṭa is that of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* defines this

defect as *"vidheyasya vimarśābhāvena guṇībhūtatvam avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśattvam"*[xv]– that is to say, the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* arises when the element that constitutes the principal predicate or the primary assertion (*vidheya*) of a sentence is not accorded its due prominence but is instead expressed in a subordinate or secondary manner, owing to an absence of proper deliberation (*vimarśa*) regarding its placement. In the technical framework of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, that which is already known to the reader or listener is designated as *anuvāda*, while that which is new or unknown constitutes the *vidheya*. According to the established canons of literary theory, the natural and correct order of composition requires that the *anuvāda* be stated first and the *vidheya* follow thereafter. When this natural order is disrupted–that is, when the *vidheya* precedes the *anuvāda*–the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* is said to occur.

In the verse beginning *"Mahattvaṃ Gaṅgāyāḥ"*, Keśava Bhaṭṭa has undertaken a description of the greatness of the Gaṅgā. However, without prior knowledge of the complete purport of the verse, the precise nature of the greatness being attributed to the Gaṅgā does not become immediately apparent to the reader at the outset. Consequently, the word *"mahattva"* functions here as the *vidheya*[xvi]– the predicate conveying something as yet unknown to the reader. The subsequent portion of the verse then proceeds to elaborate upon the specific nature of this greatness, and it is on this ground that Caitanya has referred to this *"mahattva"* as the *"mūla vidheya"*– the primary or root predicate. The term *"mūla vidheya"* denotes that predicate which bears the principal assertion or the central significance of the sentence as a whole. Alternatively, the *vidheyāṃśa*–the predicative element–holds primacy by virtue of its being the most essential and meaningful component of the statement, the one most worthy of being received and attended to. It is precisely in order to underscore this primacy of the predicative element that the *vidheya* in this instance has been designated as the *"mūla vidheya"*.

On the other hand, the word *"idam"* in the verse points to something already known, and therefore functions as the *anuvāda*. According to the prescriptions of *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, the proper order of composition requires that the *anuvāda* appear first and the *vidheya* follow thereafter. In the present verse, however, the reverse has occurred–the *vidheya "mahattva"* appears first, and the *anuvāda "idam"* follows subsequently. As a consequence of this inversion, the predicative element–the *vidheyāṃśa*–has been rendered

subordinate, and the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* has thereby arisen. This compositional irregularity further results in an impediment to the clear and immediate apprehension of meaning within the verse[xvii].

A second instance of the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* is also found in the verse at the expression *"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīḥ"*. The fact that Śrī Lakṣmī Devī is the consort residing on the lap of Bhagavān Nārāyaṇa, and that she is venerated by both gods and men, is a matter of common knowledge. The word *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* therefore functions here as the *anuvāda*. The precise import of the word *"dvitīya"*–meaning "second"–however, is not immediately apparent and remains unknown to the reader prior to its explication. It is on this ground that the word *"dvitīya"* constitutes the *vidheya* in this context. Keśava Bhaṭṭa has compounded the two words *"dvitīya"* and *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* into the single compound expression *"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmī"*, and the phrase *"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīr iva"* in the verse accordingly yields the meaning "like a second Śrī-Lakṣmī". In the proper order of composition, the *vidheya "dvitīya"* ought to have followed the *anuvāda "Śrī-Lakṣmī"*. However, by virtue of the demands of *samāsa* (compound formation) the word *"dvitīya"* has come to precede *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"*, and it is this inversion, brought about through compounding, that has given rise to the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*.

In general terms, the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* arises whenever the principal or predicative element of a sentence is expressed in a subordinate or secondary manner. In the verse of the learned Keśava Bhaṭṭa, we observe that this defect has manifested at two distinct points–in the expressions *"Mahattvaṃ Gaṅgāyāḥ satatam idam"* and *"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīḥ"*. What is particularly noteworthy in this connection is that of these two instances, one involves a *samāsa* (a compound formation) while the other does not. This distinction serves to illustrate that the subordination of the primary element may be brought about either through the mechanism of *samāsa* or through an alteration in the natural order of words (*padakrama*) within a sentence. The *Alaṅkārakaustubha*, which holds the status of one of the principal authoritative texts on *Sāhityaśāstra* within the Gauḍīya tradition, contains a substantial discussion of the subordination of the primary element through *samāsa* and presents several illustrative examples of the resultant defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*[xviii].

At this point, a problem of meaning (*artha*) has also arisen alongside the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*. The expression *"sura-narair arcya-caraṇā"* in the verse conveys that Gaṅgā Devī, like Śrī Lakṣmī Devī, is venerated at her feet by both gods and men. It is evident, therefore, that Keśava Bhaṭṭa's intention was to present the Gaṅgā as the equal of Lakṣmī–to establish a correspondence of status between the two. Had he instead constructed the phrase as *"Śrī-Lakṣmīr dvitīyā iva"*, the intended meaning–that the Gaṅgā is the equal of Lakṣmī–would have been expressed with clarity and precision, and the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* would not have arisen. The inversion brought about through compound formation has thus simultaneously compromised both the structural propriety of the verse and the transparent communication of its intended sense.

However, the use of *"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīr iva"* has not succeeded in conveying the intended equality between the Gaṅgā and Lakṣmī with any degree of adequacy. What the expression in fact communicates is rather the sense that "the Gaṅgā is like a second Lakṣmī"–and the designation *"dvitīya Lakṣmī"*, or "second Lakṣmī", does not refer to Lakṣmī herself but rather to some other entity who possesses qualities resembling those of Lakṣmī. As a consequence, instead of establishing a correspondence of equality with Lakṣmī, the expression inadvertently suggests a kind of secondariness or diminution–implying that the Gaṅgā is not Lakṣmī's equal but merely her likeness. Thus, the compounded use of the word *"dvitīya"* has produced a twofold adverse effect–on the one hand, it has given rise to the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa*, and on the other, it has undermined the very sense of equality between the Gaṅgā and Lakṣmī that the poet had intended to establish[xix]. The result is that the intended meaning has been rendered secondary and the primary expression of the poet's *bhāva* (central emotive intent) has been obstructed and impaired.

2.2 The Defect of *Viruddhamatikṛt*

In the said verse, Caitanya has identified the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt* in the compound expression *"Bhavānī-bhartuḥ"*[xx]. The term *"viruddhamatikṛt"* literally signifies "that which generates a contrary or adverse understanding." The rhetoricians (*alaṅkārikas*) have defined this *doṣa* as–*"prakṛtārtha-jñāna-pratibandhibhūta-aprakṛtārtha-jñāna-janakattvam"*[xxi]–that is to say, *viruddhamatikṛt* arises when a word or expression, by virtue of its syntactic

connection (*anvaya*) with other words in the sentence, produces a meaning that is contrary to or in conflict with the intended or primary meaning, and thereby acts as an impediment to the apprehension of that intended meaning. In other words, when the association of words within a construction leads the reader towards an understanding that runs counter to what the poet actually sought to convey, the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt* is held to have occurred.

The presence of this defect is discernible in the compound expression *"Bhavānī-bhartuḥ"* in the said verse. Here, a *ṣaṣṭhī tatpuruṣa samāsa* has been formed, carrying the meaning "the lord of Bhavānī." The etymological sense of the word *"Bhavānī"* is the consort of *"Bhava"* (Mahādeva), while the word *"bhartā"* signifies husband or lord. The compound *"Bhavānī-bhartā"* thus literally yields the meaning 'the husband of Śiva's consort'. This construction inadvertently generates the suggestion of another husband of Bhavānī, distinct from Bhava or Mahādeva himself. In common understanding, upon hearing a construction such as 'the husband of Śiva's wife', the mind is naturally led to entertain the impression that Bhavānī has a husband other than Śiva–an implication that is entirely contrary to the intended and actual meaning. In reality, Bhavānī has no husband other than Śiva or Mahādeva; he alone is her consort. The expressions 'the husband of Śiva's wife' or 'the husband of Bhavānī' thus produce a meaning that runs directly counter to the true and intended sense[xxii]. It is precisely because of the syntactic connection (*anvaya*) between the word *"Bhavānī"* and the word *"bhartṛ"* that this contrary understanding is generated, and it is on this ground that the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt* is held to be present here.

Words that, like *"Bhavānī-bhartṛ"*, carry the potential to generate a contrary or adverse sense ought to be avoided in the construction of sentences. Caitanya has furnished an analogous example to illustrate this point–*"brāhmaṇa-patnīr bhartār haste deha dāna"*, meaning "give into the hands of the husband of the brahmin's wife." The intended purport of this sentence is that one should make a gift into the hands of the husband of a brahmin woman. However, the expression *"brāhmaṇa-patnīr bhartā"*[xxiii]– 'the husband of the brahmin's wife'–inadvertently gives rise to the impression that the brahmin woman has a husband other than the brahmin himself, which is, of course, contrary to fact. In precisely the same manner, the use of *"Bhavānī-bhartā"* is liable to generate the erroneous impression that Bhavānī has a husband other than

Bhava or Mahādeva, even though no such reality exists. It is owing to this very possibility of an adverse or contradictory apprehension of meaning being generated in the reader's mind that the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt* is identified at the said point in the verse.

In general terms, the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt* arises when a word or expression, by virtue of its syntactic connection (*anvaya*) with certain other words or expressions, produces a meaning that is contrary to or in conflict with the intended sense. This is the primary condition under which this defect is held to occur. However, in certain instances, the defect may also manifest when a word is employed in an uncommon or non-prevalent sense (*aprasiddha artha*). In such cases, readers tend naturally to receive the more familiar and commonly accepted meaning of the word, which may happen to be undesirable or contrary to the poet's intention, and it is this reception of an unintended sense that gives rise to the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt*. The *Alaṅkārakaustubha* contains an extended discussion of this matter, accompanied by illustrative examples, which elaborates upon the various conditions under which this defect may be said to occur[xxiv].

2.3 The Defect of *Punarātta*

In the expression *"vibhavatyadbhuta-guṇā"* occurring in the aforementioned verse, Caitanya has identified the defect of *punarātta*[xxv]. According to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, this defect arises when, after a sentence has already been rendered complete through the mutual syntactic connection (*anvaya*) of its constituent elements–such as verbs, *kārakas* or case relations, and adjectives–an additional word that bears a relation to one already present within that completed sentence is introduced once again[xxvi]. In other words, when a sentence that is structurally and semantically self-sufficient is further extended through the superfluous addition of a related word or expression, the defect known as *punarātta* is held to have occurred. The essential condition for this defect, therefore, is the redundant introduction of a term whose semantic function has already been adequately discharged by the existing constituents of the sentence.

In the expression *"vibhavatyadbhutaguṇā"* occurring in the said verse, the verb *"vibhavati"* is present. This verb enters into syntactic connection (*anvaya*) with the relative pronoun *"yā"* found in the expression *"Bhavānī-bhartur yā śirasi"*, thereby forming the complete sentence *"yā Bhavānī-bhartuḥ śirasi vibhavati"*–meaning

"she who resides upon the head of Mahādeva." It is evident here that the sentence attains full grammatical and semantic completion through the verb *"vibhavati"* alone. However, the adjective *"adbhuta-guṇā"*–meaning "endowed with wondrous qualities"–has been appended thereafter, functioning as a qualifier of the relative pronoun *"yā"* already present in the completed sentence. Since this adjectival expression *"adbhuta-guṇā"* has been introduced after the sentence has already achieved its completion, its addition constitutes a superfluous extension of a structurally self-sufficient construction. It is on account of this redundant application of the adjective *"adbhuta-guṇā"* subsequent to the conclusion of the sentence that the defect of *punarātta* is held to have arisen at this point in the verse.

The meaning of a sentence is rendered complete through the mutual syntactic connection (*anvaya*) of its constituent elements–verbs, *kārakas*, adjectives, and the like. If, even after such completion, a further word that stands in syntactic relation to any element already present within the sentence is introduced, the defect of *punarātta* is held to arise. However, certain exceptional circumstances are also recognised in this regard. In the course of its discussion of this defect, the *Alaṅkārakaustubha* states that repetition does not constitute a defect in the following contexts–*vivāda* (debate or dispute), *vismaya* (astonishment), *harṣa* (joy), *kopa* (anger), *dainya* (humility or distress), *avadhāraṇa* (emphasis or affirmation), *prasādana* (propitiation or appeasement), *uddeśya-pratinirdeśya* (the relation between subject and predicate in a definitional statement), and *anukramya* (sequential enumeration), among others[xxvii]. That is to say, in these particular contexts, even if repetition is present, it is not to be regarded as a poetic defect. The *Alaṅkārakaustubha* contains an extended and detailed discussion of this matter, supported by illustrative examples[xxviii].

2.4 The Defect of *Bhagnakrama*

In the course of his analysis of the aforementioned verse, Caitanya has also identified the defect of *bhagnakrama*[xxix]. According to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, this defect arises when the order or compositional pattern (*krama*) adopted at the outset of a literary composition is disrupted or broken in the subsequent portions of that composition[xxx]. In other words, when a consistent mode or arrangement is not maintained throughout a piece of writing from beginning to end, the defect of *bhagnakrama* is held to occur. The

underlying principle here is one of structural and stylistic consistency–any deviation from the pattern initially established within a composition, without adequate justification, constitutes a breach of compositional propriety and gives rise to this defect.

A verse (*śloka*) typically consists of four *pādas* or metrical quarters. The verse under discussion likewise comprises four *pādas*. The first *pāda* extends from *"Mahattvaṃ Gaṅgāyāḥ"* to *"nitarāṃ"*; the second from *"yad eṣā"* to *"subhagā"*; the third from *"dvitīya"* to *"caraṇā"*; and the fourth from *"Bhavānī-bhartuḥ"* to *"adbhuta-guṇā"*. An examination of the verse reveals that the ornament of *anuprāsa* (alliteration) is present in the first, third, and fourth *pādas*. Specifically, the first *pāda* carries the alliteration of the consonant *"ta"*, the third *pāda* that of *"ra"*, and the fourth *pāda* that of *"bha"*. The second *pāda*, however, contains no such alliterative pattern. Thus, while alliteration is consistently present across three of the four *pādas*, its absence in the second *pāda* disrupts the continuity and stylistic coherence of the composition as a whole. In other words, the verse has not been constructed in a uniform manner throughout. It is on this ground that the defect of *bhagnakrama*–pertaining specifically to a disruption of sequential or stylistic regularity–is identified in the verse.

Had alliteration been present in the second *pāda* as well, or alternatively, had no *pāda* in the verse employed alliteration at all, this inconsistency would not have arisen and there would have been no occasion for the defect of *bhagnakrama* to manifest.

In the instance discussed above, the defect of *bhagnakrama* has arisen on account of a disruption in the sequential pattern of *alaṅkāra*. In a similar manner, this defect may also manifest when there is a breach in the established sequence with respect to *kārakas* (grammatical case relations), *vacana* (number) and *paryāya* (systematic arrangement or gradation) among other elements[xxxi]. The *Alaṅkārakaustubha* contains a discussion of several illustrative examples pertaining to these varying conditions under which *bhagnakrama* may occur[xxxii]. A further distinguishing characteristic of this defect is also worth noting in this connection–where no discernible order or pattern has been established from the very outset of a composition, the defect of *bhagnakrama* does not arise[xxxiii]. The defect presupposes the prior establishment of a consistent pattern; it is only the subsequent disruption of such an established pattern that constitutes the breach referred to as *bhagnakrama*.

In the course of his analysis of the aforementioned verse, Caitanya not only identified various defects at five distinct points but also pointed out the presence of five *alaṅkāras* within the same verse. However, he made it evident that owing to the defects enumerated above, the aesthetic beauty of these five *alaṅkāra*s had not been able to manifest with the fullness and clarity that they might otherwise have achieved. In other words, although the ornaments are indeed present within the verse, their inherent qualities and expressive efficacy have been considerably diminished by the predominance of the identified defects[xxxiv]. This critical observation reflects a fundamental principle of *Sāhityaśāstra*–that the mere presence of *alaṅkāra* within a composition does not in itself guarantee aesthetic excellence, for defects, when they prevail, have the capacity to impair and overshadow the very ornaments that are meant to enhance the beauty of a literary work.

In this connection, Caitanya has furnished an illuminating analogy[xxxv]–just as a beautiful body, however adorned with numerous ornaments, is considered blemished and worthy of censure if it bears even a single mark of leucoderma (*śvetakuṣṭha*), so too a verse, however richly embellished with multiple *alaṅkāras*, may have the cumulative beauty of those very ornaments undermined and compromised if even a single defect is present within it. The analogy is instructive in its implications–the presence of ornamentation, however abundant, does not render a composition immune to the adverse effects of a defect; on the contrary, a solitary defect possesses the capacity to detract from the overall aesthetic effect of the entire composition, much as a single blemish on an otherwise beautiful form diminishes the very splendour that the ornaments were intended to enhance.

3. **The Five Ornaments (*Pañca Alaṅkāra*)**

The five *alaṅkāras* identified in the verse under discussion are–*anuprāsa*, *punaruktavadābhāsa*, *upamā*, *virodhābhāsa*, and *anumāna*. Of these, the first two belong to the category of *śabdālaṅkāra*–ornaments that operate primarily at the level of sound–while the remaining three are *arthālaṅkāras*–ornaments that function at the level of meaning[xxxvi]. Each of these will now be taken up for detailed discussion in the order in which they have been enumerated.

3.1 Anuprāsa

The *Anuprāsa* is present in the first, third, and fourth *pādas* of the verse under discussion[xxxvii]. Etymologically, *"anu"* signifies "after"

or "following", and *"prāsa"* denotes "placing" or "setting down" in an excellent manner–thus *anuprāsa* refers to the placement of one consonant of a particular class immediately after another consonant of the same class[xxxviii]. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* defines *Anuprāsa* as–*"anuprāsaḥ śabdasāmyaṃ vaiṣamye'pi svarasya yat*[xxxix]*"*–that is, *Anuprāsa* consists in the creation of a similarity of sound through the repetition of consonants, even when the vowels accompanying those consonants differ from one another. It is the similarity of consonants, rather than that of vowels, which is accorded primary significance here, and it is precisely this consonantal correspondence that produces a particular kind of aesthetic charm and delight within a poetic composition. The repeated occurrence of consonants of the same class generates a musical resonance within the verse that constitutes the essential beauty of this ornament.

The application of the *Anuprāsa* is clearly discernible in three *pādas* of the aforementioned verse. In the first *pāda*–*"Mahattvaṃ Gaṅgāyāḥ satatam idamābhāti nitarāṃ"*–a similarity of sound has been created through the multiple repetition of the consonant *"ta"*. In the third *pāda*–*"Dvitīya-Śrī-Lakṣmīr iva sura-narair arcya-caraṇā"*–an analogous phonetic correspondence is produced through the repeated occurrence of the consonant *"ra"*. In a similar manner, the fourth *pāda*–*"Bhavānī-bhartur yā śirasi vibhavaty adbhuta-guṇā"*–exhibits a noticeable repetition of the consonant *"bha"*, which occurs four times within the *pāda*. As a consequence of this repeated consonantal occurrence, a similarity of sound has been achieved through the recurrence of the consonant, notwithstanding the variation in the accompanying vowels. Since the consonants beginning with *"ta"* and related sounds recur repeatedly across the verse, the specific variety of *Anuprāsa* that has manifested here is *Vṛttyanuprāsa*–that form of alliteration which is characterised by the repeated recurrence of the same consonant or consonantal cluster multiple times within a given stretch of composition.

In general terms, consonantal similarity has been referred to here as *Anuprāsa*. However, such similarity may occur either once or multiple times within a given composition. It is on the basis of this difference in the frequency of recurrence that *anuprāsa* is further divided into two subcategories–*Chekānuprāsa* and *Vṛttyanuprāsa*. When a particular arrangement of consonants of the same class occurs only once, it constitutes *Chekānuprāsa*[xl]. When this *Chekānuprāsa* is further realised through consonants that are

expressive of sweetness and grace, it is designated as *Upanāgarikā vṛtti*[xli]. On the other hand, when a single consonant or a group of consonants recurs repeatedly in a habitual or systematic pattern, the ornament that arises is *Vṛttyanuprāsa*[xlii]. In the aforementioned verse of Keśava Bhaṭṭa, since consonants beginning with *"ta"* and related sounds recur more than once in a pattern of consonantal similarity, the variety of *anuprāsa* that has manifested in the verse is *vṛttyanuprāsa*.

3.2 Punaruktavadābhāsa

In the expression *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* occurring in the verse under discussion, Caitanya has identified the *Punaruktavadābhāsa*[xliii]. According to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, *Punaruktavadābhāsa* arises when two words are employed in a sentence that appear at first glance to be synonymous with one another–giving the impression that the same meaning has been repeated–but which are, in actuality, used in distinct and different senses[xliv]. In other words, *Punaruktavadābhāsa* denotes that condition in which the repetition of meaning appears to have occurred but has not in fact done so. The term itself is instructive in this regard–*"punarukta"* signifies repetition, *"vad"* signifies resemblance or appearance, and *"ābhāsa"* denotes a semblance or illusion–thus the compound yields the sense of "that which has the appearance or semblance of repetition without actually being so[xlv]." In general, this *alaṅkāra* is produced through the deliberate use of different words that create such an impression of apparent semantic redundancy, while in reality each word contributes a distinct shade of meaning to the composition.

The expression *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* in the said verse serves as an instance of the ornament of *Punaruktavadābhāsa*. One of the recognised meanings of the word *"Śrī"* is *"Lakṣmī"*. Consequently, upon encountering the compound *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"*, it appears at first glance as though the word *"Lakṣmī"* has been uttered twice–once through the word *"Śrī"* and once again through the word *"Lakṣmī"* itself. In this manner, if the meaning of *"Śrī"* is taken to be *"Lakṣmī"*, the compound *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* appears to contain two synonymous words, giving the impression that the same meaning has been repeated. In reality, however, no such repetition has occurred. This is because the word *"Śrī"* has not been employed in the sense of *"Lakṣmī"* in this particular context, but rather in the sense of "beauty" or "radiance" (*śobhā*). Viewed from this perspective, the compound *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* yields the meaning "Lakṣmī endowed with

beauty" or "the resplendent Lakṣmī." The two words *"Śrī"* and *"Lakṣmī"* are therefore not genuinely synonymous here but have been employed in distinct senses. For this reason, no actual defect of repetition (*Punaruktadoṣa*) has occurred. Nevertheless, since the semblance or appearance of repetition presents itself to the reader at first encounter, the ornament of *Punaruktavadābhāsa* is held to have manifested at this point in the verse.

The ornament of *Punaruktavadābhāsa* generally involves the use of two apparently synonymous words, giving rise to the impression that the same meaning has been repeated. As in the verse under discussion, the two words *"Śrī"* and *"Lakṣmī"*–appearing to be synonymous–seem to reiterate one another, thereby creating the impression that the meaning of *"Lakṣmī"* has been expressed twice over. In the course of the discussion pertaining to this ornament, the *Alaṅkārakaustubha*–an authoritative text of the Gauḍīya tradition–states that *Punaruktavadābhāsa* may be of two kinds, namely *śabdaniṣṭha* and *śabdārthaniṣṭha*[xlvi]. Where only two synonymous words appear to be repeated while no actual repetition of meaning occurs, the ornament that arises is designated as *śabdaniṣṭha Punaruktavadābhāsa*[xlvii]–that is, a semblance of repetition that resides purely at the level of the word itself. In this variety, the impression of redundancy is generated solely through the phonetic or lexical proximity of the two words employed, without any corresponding duplication at the level of meaning.

On the other hand, where the semblance of repetition extends beyond the level of the word and manifests at the level of meaning as well–that is, where both the words and their meanings appear to have been repeated–the ornament that arises is designated as *śabdārthaniṣṭha punaruktavadābhāsa*. In this variety, the impression of redundancy operates simultaneously at two levels: the phonetic or lexical and the semantic. In the expression *"Śrī-Lakṣmī"* occurring in the verse under discussion, the semblance of repetition is discernible not only in the two apparently synonymous words themselves but also in their meanings, inasmuch as both *"Śrī"* and *"Lakṣmī"* appear to convey the same referential sense. It is on this ground that the instance of *punaruktavadābhāsa* present in this verse is to be understood as belonging to the *śabdārthaniṣṭha* variety–one in which the appearance of repetition encompasses both word and meaning together.

3.3 Upamā

Upamā is present in the expression *"Lakṣmīr iva sura-narair arcya-caraṇā"* occurring in the verse composed by Keśava Bhaṭṭa[xlviii]. According to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, *Upamā* manifests when two objects are compared on the basis of a common property or quality (*sāmāna dharma*) shared between them[xlix]. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* defines *Upamā* as–*"sāmyaṃ vācyam avaidharmyaṃ vākyaika upamā dvayoḥ[l]"*–that is, when the similarity between two objects is explicitly expressed (*vācya*) within a single sentence, and no contradictory or opposing property is mentioned in relation to them, *Upamā* is held to be present. Within the technical framework of *Upamā*, the primary object–that is, the object in which a resemblance to another object is being demonstrated–is designated as the *upameya* or the subject of comparison, while the secondary object–that to which the primary object is being likened–is designated as the *upamāna* or the standard of comparison. The quality on the basis of which the comparison is drawn is referred to as the *sāmānadharma* or *sāmānadharmata*.

The application of the ornament of *upamā* is discernible in the expression *"Lakṣmīr iva sura-narair arcya-caraṇā"* occurring in the verse under discussion. This description conveys that just as gods and men venerate the feet of Devī Lakṣmī, so too do they offer their reverence at the feet of the Gaṅgā. In this comparison, Lakṣmī serves as the *upamāna*–the standard of comparison–while the Gaṅgā functions as the *upameya*–the subject of comparison. Between the two, there exists a common property (*sāmāna dharma*) in the form of *arcaṇīyatā*–the quality of being worthy of veneration and worship. It is precisely on the basis of this shared quality that the Gaṅgā has been compared to Lakṣmī. Thus, by virtue of the common property of *arcaṇīyatā* subsisting between Lakṣmī and the Gaṅgā, *Upamā* manifests in the expression *"Lakṣmīr iva"*–the word *"iva"* itself serving as the explicit marker of comparison (*upamāvācaka*) that signals the presence of this ornament within the verse.

Upamā generally comprises four constituent elements (*aṅga*)–the *upamāna* (the standard of comparison), the *upameya* (the subject of comparison), the *sāmāna dharma* (the common property shared between the two), and the *sādṛśyavācaka* word–that is, a word explicitly denoting similarity, such as *"iva"* and its equivalents. When all four of these constituent elements are present and

explicitly stated within a given instance of *upamā*, it is designated as *pūrṇopamā*–the complete or full simile. The expression discussed above constitutes an example of *pūrṇopamā*. Here, the feet of Lakṣmī serve as the *upamāna*, the feet of the Gaṅgā as the *upameya*, *arcaṇīyatā*–the quality of being worthy of veneration–as the *sāmāna dharma*, and the word *"iva"* as the *sādṛśyavācaka*–the explicit marker of similarity. Since all four constituent elements are present and accounted for in this instance, it is accordingly designated as *Pūrṇopamā*. Conversely, when one, two, or three of these four constituent elements are absent or left unstated in an instance of the ornament of *Upamā*, the resulting figure is designated as *Luptopamā*[li]–the incomplete or elliptical simile.

In general terms, *Upamā* is said to occur whenever the *upamāna* and the *upameya* are related through any form of common property (*sāmāna dharma*) subsisting between them. In this connection, the *Alaṅkārakaustubha* advances a particularly significant theoretical proposition. It holds that if the common property (*sādharmya*) between two objects–that is, between the *upamāna* and the *upameya*–is present in its entirety and without any remainder, the relationship between them does not qualify as *Upamā*. For the figure of *Upamā* to be properly constituted, the common property must be present only in a partial or qualified manner–that is, the similarity must subsist between the two objects to a certain degree but not in all respects completely. It is only when such a partial or qualified correspondence obtains between the *upamāna* and the *upameya* that the relationship between them is to be regarded as a genuine instance of the ornament of *upamā*. This theoretical position reflects a fundamental distinction between identity (*abheda*) and similarity (*sādṛśya*)–complete correspondence between two objects dissolves the very basis of comparison, whereas partial correspondence sustains it[lii].

3.4 Virodhābhāsa

In the expression *"eṣā Śrī-Viṣṇoś caraṇa-kamalottpatti-subhagā"* occurring in the verse under discussion, *Virodhābhāsa* has been identified specifically in the compound *"kamalottpatti-subhagā*[liii]*"*. According to *Alaṅkāraśāstra*, *Virodhābhāsa* arises when, in the subject under description, there appears at first glance to be a contradiction or opposition, whereas in reality no such contradiction actually exists. The *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, states that *Virodhābhāsa*–that is, the semblance of contradiction–occurs when an apparent mutual opposition presents itself between *jāti* (class or

genus) and *jāti*; between *guṇa* (quality) and any of the three–*jāti*, *guṇa*, or *kriyā* (action); between *kriyā* and *kriyā* or *dravya* (substance); or between *dravya* and *dravya*. In each of these cases, the contradiction that appears to subsist between the two elements is not a genuine or real opposition but merely an apparent one–a semblance of conflict that dissolves upon closer examination of the actual meaning and context of the expression[liv].

The expression *"eṣā Śrī-Viṣṇoś caraṇa-kamalottpatti-subhagā"* in the said verse conveys the meaning that the Gaṅgā is supremely blessed by virtue of her origin at the lotus feet of Śrī Viṣṇu. The ornament of *virodhābhāsa* has manifested specifically in the compound *"kamalotpatti"*. The statement asserts that the Gaṅgā–who is of the nature of water–took her birth from the lotus (*kamala*) that constitutes the feet of Viṣṇu. However, in common natural experience, it is the lotus that is born in water; water is never born from within a lotus. The assertion that the Gaṅgā had her origin within a lotus therefore appears to run contrary to the established order of natural reality.

In actuality, however, no genuine contradiction exists here. For while the birth of ordinary water from an ordinary lotus is indeed impossible, the birth of the Gaṅgā–who is of the nature of water–from the lotus feet of Śrī Viṣṇu has been made possible through the *acintya śakti*–the inconceivable divine power–of the Lord. Thus, although an apparent contradiction exists between this assertion and the ordinary laws governing the natural world, it is entirely acceptable from both a theological and a poetic standpoint. In this instance, the contradiction that presents itself is between two *kriyās* or actions–the origination of the lotus from water on the one hand, and the origination of water from the lotus on the other. The *Virodhābhāsa* operative here is therefore of the variety involving an apparent opposition between *kriyā* and *kriyā*.

It is worth noting in this connection that the Gaṅgā is the presiding deity (*adhiṣṭhātrī devī*) of water and is conceived of as water itself in its divine form. In this sense, the word *"Gaṅgā"* has been employed in the verse in the meaning of water. On the other hand, it is a universally known truth that the lotus originates in water. Consequently, when the verse asserts that the Gaṅgā–who is of the nature of water–was born from the lotus that constitutes the feet of Viṣṇu, this remarkable statement generates a particular sense of wonder and aesthetic delight (*camatkāra*). It is precisely because this wonder-producing quality of the expression enhances

the beauty of the verse that it has been designated as an *alaṅkāra*–a literary ornament. Although an apparent contradiction presents itself to the reader at first encounter, it is not a genuine contradiction in any real sense but merely a semblance or appearance of opposition. The actual meaning, upon reflection, resolves the apparent conflict entirely. It is on this very ground–that what appears to be a contradiction is in truth no contradiction at all but only its semblance–that this ornament has been designated *virodhābhāsa*, literally meaning "the appearance" or "the semblance of contradiction."

In the ornament of *virodhābhāsa*, although a contradiction appears to present itself on the surface, no genuine opposition exists in reality. In general terms, contradiction (*virodha*) implies a conflict between at least two entities or elements. With regard to the possible nature of these two elements, the rhetoricians (*alaṅkārikas*) have specified ten categories of combinatory relations (*saṃyoga-sthala*) within which such apparent opposition may manifest[lv]. These are–the apparent conflict between *jāti* and *jāti* (genus and genus), between *jāti* and *guṇa* (genus and quality), between *jāti* and *kriyā* (genus and action), between *jāti* and *dravya* (genus and substance), between *guṇa* and *guṇa* (quality and quality), between *guṇa* and *kriyā* (quality and action), between *guṇa* and *dravya* (quality and substance), between *kriyā* and *kriyā* (action and action), between *kriyā* and *dravya* (action and substance), and between *dravya* and *dravya* (substance and substance). Each of these ten combinatory categories has been discussed in detail with illustrative examples in texts such as the *Alaṅkārakaustubha* and related works of the Gauḍīya tradition[lvi].

3.5 Anumāna

In the first two *pādas* of the said verse, Caitanya has identified the *Anumāna alaṅkāra*[lvii]. When the *sādhya*–that which is to be established or demonstrated–is established by means of the *sādhana*–the instrument or ground of demonstration–the process is designated as *anumāna*. Here, that which is established or proved is called the *sādhya*, and that by means of which it is established is called the *sādhana*. When the mention of both *sādhya* and *sādhana* within a poetic composition results in an enhancement of the beauty of the verse, *anumāna* is held to have manifested. Since, as in logical inference (*anumāna*), three constituents are present here as well–*sādhya*, *sādhana*, and *hetu* (the reason or ground)–this ornament has been designated *Anumāna alaṅkāra*[lviii]. The

Sāhityadarpaṇa defines *Anumāna alaṙkāra* as–*"anumānaṃ tu vicchittyā jñānaṃ sādhyasya sādhanāt*[lix]*"*–that is, the ornament of *Anumāna* consists in the knowledge or apprehension of the *sādhya*–the conclusion to be established–as conveyed through the *sādhana* in a manner that produces aesthetic wonder and delight (*vicchitti* or *camatkāra*).

The presence of the ornament of *anumāna* is discernible in the first two *pādas* of the verse under discussion. The central subject of demonstration (*pratipādya*) in the verse is the greatness (*mahattva*) of the Gaṅgā, and the primary purpose of the verse is accordingly the establishment of that greatness. It is for this reason that the greatness of the Gaṅgā has been taken as the *sādhya*–the conclusion to be established–in this context. On the other hand, the ground adduced in support of this greatness is the Gaṅgā's *Viṣṇupādotpatti*–her origin from the lotus feet of Śrī Viṣṇu. The origin of the Gaṅgā from the lotus feet of Viṣṇu thus constitutes the *sādhana*–the instrument or ground by means of which her greatness is established and demonstrated. *Anumāna* manifests in a poetic composition when the *sādhya* is apprehended through the *sādhana* in a manner that generates aesthetic wonder and delight. In the verse under discussion, the greatness of the Gaṅgā–the *sādhya*–is made known through the *sādhana* of her origin from the lotus feet of Viṣṇu, and the remarkable manner in which this relation between *sādhya* and *sādhana* has been expressed has served to enhance the overall aesthetic beauty of the composition. It is on these grounds that *Anumāna* is held to manifest with clarity and fullness in the first two *pādas* of the verse under discussion.

In this manner, Caitanya undertook a detailed and systematic analysis of the verse composed by Keśava Bhaṭṭa, identifying five instances of poetic defect and five instances of literary ornament within it. He further observed that the learned Keśava Bhaṭṭa was endowed with a special and extraordinary poetic genius (*pratibhā*) bestowed upon him through divine grace, by virtue of which he was capable of composing verses fluently and in rapid succession, with little recourse to deliberate reflection or careful consideration. However, Caitanya indicated that it is quite natural for poetic defects of one kind or another to find their way into compositions produced without adequate critical deliberation (*vicāra*). He also suggested that upon closer and more refined analysis, many more defects as well as merits could potentially be discovered within the said verse. It is for this reason, he implied, that the critical evaluation of defects and merits (*doṣa-guṇa vicāra*) is of the utmost

importance in the composition of poetry. For when a composition that is free from defects is further enriched through the incorporation of appropriate literary ornaments, it attains a higher degree of purity and aesthetic excellence, and its beauty is correspondingly enhanced and rendered more complete[lx].

On the other hand, upon witnessing Caitanya's extraordinary erudition in *Sāhitya śāstra*, the learned Keśava Bhaṭṭa was overcome with astonishment. He began to reflect inwardly–how could this young Nimāi Paṇḍita, who taught nothing more than the elementary *Kālāpa* grammar and who appeared never to have studied *Alaṅkāraśāstra* or related disciplines, have carried out such a remarkably subtle and penetrating critical analysis of a verse composed by a *digvijayī* scholar of his own standing! This reflection left him utterly bewildered and at a loss. A doubt arose in his mind that Devī Sarasvatī–the goddess of learning–had perhaps turned unfavourable towards him. For the kind of profound and refined exegesis that Nimāi Paṇḍita had offered was simply not within the capacity of an ordinary person; it seemed as though Sarasvatī herself had given expression to this analysis through the mouth of Nimāi[lxi]. Overcome by this thought, Keśava Bhaṭṭa was seized with a deep sense of shame, and the pride and arrogance that he had carried within himself over many years were shattered and reduced to nothing.

At this juncture, when the disciples, delighted at the defeat of the *digvijayī*, were on the verge of breaking into laughter, Caitanya Deva restrained them[lxii]. Perceiving the inner transformation that had come over Keśava Bhaṭṭa, he offered him words of comfort and consolation. He also expressed his admiration for the extraordinary poetic genius (*pratibhā*) with which Keśava Bhaṭṭa was endowed[lxiii]. Addressing the *digvijayī* with studied humility, Caitanya submitted that, overcome by the natural impulsiveness of youth, he had engaged in a certain degree of presumptuous prattle in his presence, and had had the audacity to pass critical judgement on the merits and defects of a verse composed by so eminent a poet. He further submitted that he himself did not in reality possess the qualification or competence for such an undertaking, and that he was, in truth, not even worthy to be counted among the disciples of Keśava Bhaṭṭa. In both learning and age, Keśava Bhaṭṭa was his superior in every respect, and he therefore earnestly entreated him to pardon this childlike and presumptuous conduct on his part.

After this exchange, both parties returned to their respective residences. That night, Keśava Bhaṭṭa worshipped Devī Sarasvatī and laid before her feet the anguish that weighed upon his heart. Devī Sarasvatī, pleased with his devotion, appeared to him in a dream and imparted to him the counsel he needed. The Devī declared that Śrī Caitanya Deva is the lord of infinite universes, and that she herself is but an eternal handmaid residing at his lotus feet[lxiv]. Before that supreme Bhagavān–he who expounds the Vedas through a thousand tongues–it is simply not possible for her own power to exercise any efficacy whatsoever[lxv]. It was through the Devī's counsel that Keśava Bhaṭṭa came to understand that Nimāi Paṇḍita was no ordinary human being but was in truth the Lord himself–the Supreme Bhagavān in person. Through the grace and guidance of Devī Sarasvatī, all the impurities of pride and arrogance that had accumulated within the heart of Keśava Bhaṭṭa were entirely and completely dissolved[lxvi]. The following morning, he came before Caitanya and surrendered himself at his feet, taking refuge in him with wholehearted submission. Caitanya, in turn, was pleased with him and bestowed his grace upon him, granting him shelter at his own feet. It was in this manner that a profound spiritual transformation came about in the life of the *digvijayī* scholar Keśava Bhaṭṭa, and he advanced upon the path towards liberation from the bonds of worldly existence[lxvii].

4. Conclusion

Śrī Caitanya Deva descended upon this earth in the combined form (*yugala rūpa*) of Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa and his eternal consort and companion in divine play, Śrī Rādhā. The movement of devotion (*bhakti āndolana*) that he inaugurated brought about a truly epoch-making transformation in the religious and cultural life of contemporary India. As the propounder of the path of *bhakti*, he is venerated across the entire world, and this aspect of his identity is universally known and widely acknowledged.

However, the dimension of his profound scholastic learning is not as widely familiar to the general reader. At the time of Caitanya Deva's appearance, Navadvīpa occupied a position as one of the foremost centres of scriptural learning in the whole of India, distinguished particularly for its cultivation of *nyāya* and *vyākaraṇa*. It is therefore quite natural that Caitanya Deva was an accomplished scholar in both these disciplines, and on this point there exists no disagreement within learned circles. What

constitutes the central concern of the present discussion, however, is his equally profound mastery of Sanskrit *Sāhitya śāstra*–a dimension of his erudition that has received comparatively less attention. In the domain of Sanskrit learning, proficiency in one discipline is often accompanied by a general familiarity with others; but the precise identification of defects, merits, and ornaments at every point within a composition demands a degree of specialised and deep competence in *Sāhitya śāstra* that goes considerably beyond general acquaintance. In the episode under discussion, Caitanya Deva identified five instances of poetic defect and five instances of literary ornament within a single Sanskrit verse–a verse composed, it must be emphasised, by the *digvijayī* scholar Keśava Bhaṭṭa himself. The critical analysis of a verse composed by so eminent a scholar requires extraordinary command over the principles of *Sāhitya śāstra*, and it is this that demonstrates unambiguously that Caitanya Deva was a scholar of the highest order in this discipline as well.

Furthermore, notwithstanding his towering scholarship, the manner in which he consoled Keśava Bhaṭṭa reveals the remarkable magnanimity and largeness of spirit that characterised him. Through this conduct, he appears to have imparted the teaching that even one who has attained the highest pinnacle of learning ought not to harbour pride or arrogance within himself. Caitanya Deva is the *yugāvatāra*–the *avatāra* of the age–and such magnanimity is therefore entirely natural to him. Yet, even so, through this exemplary conduct, he appears to have conveyed to humanity at large the enduring lesson of the renunciation of ego and the abandonment of arrogance.

Works Cited:

Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī. *Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta* (Ādilīlā, Second Part). Edited by Radhagovinda Nath, Sadhana Prakashani, 2006.

Kedārabhaṭṭa. Vṛttaratnākara. Edited by Baladeva Upadhyay, Varanasi: Choukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, 2017.

Vrindavandas. *Śrīśrīcaitanyabhāgavata.* Edited by Baridvaran Ghosh, Kolkata: Dey's Publishing, 1995.

End Notes:

i *"Rādhā kṛṣṇa-praṇaya-vikṛtir hlādinī śaktir asmād ekātmānāv api bhuvi purā deha-bhedaṃ gatau tau, Caitanyākhyaṃ prakaṭam adhunā tad dvayaṃ caikyam āptaṃ rādhā-bhāva-dyuti-suvalitaṃ naumi kṛṣṇa-svarūpam."*–(*Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta,* edited by Radhagovinda Nath, Sadhana Prakashani, 2006, 1.1.5)

The divine love (*praṇaya*) of Śrīmatī Rādhārāṇī for Bhagavān Śrī Kṛṣṇa is a particular manifestation of his innermost potency of bliss–the *hlādinī śakti*. In their essential nature, Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa are one and the same reality, non-different from one another; yet, from time immemorial, they have manifested in two distinct forms for the purpose of relishing the full flavour (*rasa*) of their divine *līlā*. In a subsequent manifestation, those same Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa reunited in a single form and appeared as Śrī Caitanya Mahāprabhu, resplendent with the luminous spiritual disposition (*bhāva*) of Rādhā.

ii *"..., Sannyāsakṛc chamaḥ śānto niṣṭhā śāntiḥ parāyaṇaḥ. Suvarṇavarṇo hemāṅgo varāṅgaś candanāṅgadī... ."*–*Mahābhārata* 13.149.75, 92

In his commentary on the first of these two verses, Baladeva Ācārya has interpreted all six of the epithets contained therein as referring specifically to Caitanya Deva. His explanations are as follows–*"sannyāsaṃ parivrajyaṃ karotīti sannyāsakṛt"*: he is designated *sannyāsakṛt* because he embraces the life of renunciation (*sannyāsa*) and wandering asceticism (*parivrajya*). *"śamayaty ālocayati rahasyaṃ harer iti śamaḥ"*: he is *śama* because he deliberates upon and illuminates the deeper mysteries pertaining to Hari. *"śāmyaty uparamati kṛṣṇānya-viṣayād iti śāntaḥ"*: he is *śānta* because he remains entirely withdrawn from all subjects other than Kṛṣṇa. *"nitiṣṭhanty asyāṃ hari-kīrtana-pradhānā bhakti-yajñā iti niṣṭhā"*: he is *niṣṭhā* because all devotional sacrifices (*bhakti-yajña*) centred on the glorification of Hari find their firm foundation in him. *"śāmyanti anayā bhakti-virodhiṇaḥ kevalādvaita-pramukhā iti śāntiḥ"*: he is *śānti* because through him, the doctrines opposed to *bhakti*–foremost among which is *kevalādvaita*–are brought to rest and resolution. *"mahābhāvāntānāṃ bhāva-bhedānāṃ parama-mayanam iti parāyaṇam"*: he is *parāyaṇa* because he is the supreme resort and culmination of all varieties of spiritual disposition (*bhāva*), up to and including *mahābhāva* itself.

Baladeva Ācārya has expounded upon the second verse in the following manner–*"suvarṇasyeva varṇo rūpam asyeti suvarṇavarṇaḥ"*: Śrī Caitanya Deva is *suvarṇavarṇa* because his bodily complexion is of the hue of refined gold. *"hemavat spṛhaṇīyāni varṇādhiṣṭhānāni aṅgāni yasya sa hemāṅgaḥ"*: he is *hemāṅga* because his limbs, like gold, are most worthy of admiration and longing. *"varāṇi saundarya-vanti aṅgāni asyeti varāṅgaḥ"*: he is *varāṅga* because all his limbs are endowed with the finest beauty. *"candane bhakta-cittāhlādake aṅgade asyeti candanāṅgadī"*: he is *candanāṅgadī* because the ornament of sandalwood (*candana*) that adorns his form produces a profound sense of delight within the hearts of his devotees. In sum, the bodily lustre of Śrī Caitanya Deva is comparable to that of gold, his limbs are equally worthy of reverence and admiration, his entire form is of surpassing beauty, and the sandalwood ornament adorning him fills the minds of the devoted with deep and abiding joy.

iii *"..., Nimāñi Paṇḍita hay baṛa vidyāvān.*
Digvijayī hāriyā calilā yāṃr ṭhāñi,

Eta baṛa paṇḍita ār kathā śuni nāñi."–(Vṛndāvana Dāsa, *Śrī Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata*, edited by Baridavaran Ghosh, Dey's Publishing, 1995 p. 76)

iv *"Prabhura pāṇḍitya-buddhi śiśukāla haite, … ."–(Vṛndāvana Dāsa, Śrī Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata, p. 70)*

v *"Tathāpiha hena tāna māyāra baṛāi,*
Bujhibāre pāre tāne hena jana nāi."–(Vṛndāvana Dāsa, Śrī Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata, p. 70)

vi *"Vyākaraṇa-madhye jāni paṛāha Kālāpa, … ."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.30)*

vii *"…, Digvijayī kahe, mane avajñā kariyā —.*
Vyākaraṇa paṛāha Nimāi Paṇḍita tomāra nāma,
Bālyaśāstra loka tomāra kahe guṇagrāma."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.28-29)

viii The title *Ghaṭikāśataka* is a distinction of a particular kind. In ancient times, a special form of examination existed for the purpose of testing the erudition and poetic capacity of learned scholars. In this examination, the designated individual was required to compose one hundred Sanskrit verses within the span of a single *ghaṭikā*–that is, approximately twenty-four minutes.

A scholar who succeeded in composing one hundred verses within this stipulated period was honoured with the title *Ghaṭikāśataka* in recognition of his extraordinary poetic genius (*kāvya-pratibhā*) and breadth of learning. This title was regarded, within the learned communities of the time, as a distinguished marker of three specific and rare intellectual capacities–the power of poetic composition (*kavitvśakti*), the power of retention and recall (*smṛtiśakti*), and the power of instantaneous or extemporaneous composition (*tatkṣaṇa-racanāśakti*). Together, these three capacities represented the highest standard of creative and scholarly accomplishment that the scholarly culture of the period recognised and celebrated.

ix Caitanya Deva was widely celebrated as a *śrutadhara*–a term designating one who is capable of grasping any subject upon a single hearing and retaining it in memory over a prolonged period of time without difficulty. It was by virtue of this particular gift that Śrī Caitanya Deva possessed a faculty of retention and recall of exceptional sharpness and depth. Upon hearing any scriptural text or learned discussion even once, he was able to comprehend it with ease and retain it with fidelity. This capacity of instantaneous comprehension and enduring retention was recognised as a distinguishing characteristic of his intellectual constitution, and it set him apart as a scholar of remarkable natural endowment within the learned circles of his time.

x *"…, Vismita hañā digvijayī Prabhure puchila —.*
Jhañjhāvāta prāya āmi śloka paṛila,
Tāra madhye śloka tumi kaiche kaṇṭhe kaila?."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.39-40)

xi *"Pañca doṣa ei śloke, pañca alaṅkāra,"–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.51)*

xii *"Rasopkarṣako doṣaḥ. Apakarṣakaḥ sthaganakārī."*–(*Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, 10.1)

xiii *"Avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa dui ṭhāñi cihna,*

Viruddhamati bhagnakrama punarātta doṣa tina."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.52)

xiv The defining characteristic (*lakṣaṇa*) of the *Śikhariṇī* metre is —

"Rasai rudraiś chinnā yamanasabhalāgaḥ śikhariṇī", (Kedārabhaṭṭa, *Vṛttaratnākara*, edited by Baladeva Upadhyay, Chaukhamba Surabharati Prakashan, 2017, 3.123). The *Śikhariṇī* meter contains 5 gaṇas i.e. *ya (laghu-guru-guru)*, *ma (guru-guru-guru)*, *na (laghu-laghu-laghu)*, *sa (guru-guru-laghu)*, *bha (guru-laghu-laghu)* followed by one *laghu* and one *guru*. The halts will be on the 6th and 17th letters.

xv Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa, edited by Krishnamohan Shastri, Chaukhambha Sanskrit Sansthan, 2015, p. 479.

xvi *"Gaṅgāra mahattva śloke mūla vidheya,*

Idaṃ śabda anuvāda pāche avidhheya."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.53)

xvii *"Vidheya āge kahi, pāche kahile anuvāda,*

Ei lāgi ślokera artha kariyāche bāda."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.54)

xviii For example —

"Akṛtaṃ sukṛtaṃ kiñcid ataptañ ca tathā tapaḥ,

Bhaveyaṃ yena te nātha karuṇālava-bhājanam."

The meaning of this verse is–O Lord (*nātha*)! Whatever meritorious deed (*sukṛta*) might enable me to become a recipient of even a particle of your grace (*karuṇālava*) remains unperformed (*akṛta*), and whatever austerity (*tapaḥ*) might serve the same purpose remains unpractised (*ataptam*). In this verse, the negatory particle *nañ* ought to hold primary significance, but by virtue of its being absorbed into a compound (*samāsa*), it has been rendered secondary. Similarly, the expression *karuṇālava*–meaning "a particle of grace"–ought likewise to have been accorded primary prominence, but it too has been subordinated through compounding. As a consequence of these inversions, the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* has arisen in the verse. Had the verse been composed without recourse to compound formation, this defect would not have occurred. That is to say, had the verse been composed in the following manner —

"Na kṛtaṃ sukṛtaṃ kiñcin na taptaṃ ca tathā tapaḥ,

Mayi yena bhaven nātha karuṇāyā lavo'pi te."

— both the negatory sense (*nañārtha*) and the meaning of "a particle of grace" (*karuṇākaṇā*) would have retained their due prominence, and in such a case there would have been no occasion for the defect of *avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* to arise.

It may further be noted that in those instances where it is necessary to convey a specific denotation (*abhidhāna*) of the compounded substance together with the negatory particle *nañ*, the formation of a compound with *nañ* does not give rise to any defect. An illustrative example of this is the following verse —

"Anāsaktaḥ karma kurvan nasakto viṣayān juṣan,

Apramatto bhajan kṛṣṇaṃ na sa tais tair nibadhyate."

The meaning of this verse is–one who performs his prescribed duties without attachment (*anāsakta*), who engages with sense objects without being tainted by them (*asaktaḥ*), and who worships Śrī Kṛṣṇa without negligence or inattention (*apramatta*)–such a person is not bound by those very activities. In this verse, the specific denotation of

words such as *āsakta* and related terms in conjunction with the negatory particle *naña* is indispensable to the intended meaning. It is for this reason that, notwithstanding the formation of a compound with *naña*, no defect has arisen here.–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, pp. 725–728).

xix *"Dvitīya Śrī-Lakṣmī ihāña dvitīya vidheya,*
Samāse gauṇa ha-ila, śabdārtha gela kṣaya.
Dvitīya śabda vidheya, tāhā paṛila samāse,
Lakṣmīra samatā artha karila vināśe."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.55-56)

xx *"Bhavānī-bhartṛ-śabda dile pāiyā santoṣa,*
Viruddhamatikṛt nāma ei mahā doṣa."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.58)

xxi Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa, p.478

xxii *"Bhavānī-śabde kahe Mahādevera gṛhiṇī,*
Tāra bhartā kahile dvitīya bhartā jāni."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.59)

xxiii *Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.61*

xxiv For example—

"Samāṃsamīnāvali-cārayadbhir gavāṃ kulaṃ vallava-bāla-vṛndaiḥ,
Vṛndāvane kautuka-keli-lolaḥ punātu vaḥ Śrī-Vraja-rāja-sūnuḥ."

The meaning of this verse is–may the son of the king of Vraja (*Vraja-rāja-sūnuḥ*), who is perpetually eager for playful sport and delightful games (*keli-kautuka*) in Vṛndāvana, in the company of the cowherd boys who tend the herds of cattle endowed with the characteristic of *samāṃsamīnāvali*, protect you all. The expression *"samāṃsamīnāvali-viśiṣṭa"* refers to that class of cows which calves every year without fail–it is in this specific and intended sense that the compound has been employed in the verse. However, upon encountering this expression, the minds of readers naturally tend to receive a quite different meaning–namely, "accompanied by a collection of flesh and fish" (*māṃsa-mīnāvali sahita*)–an entirely unintended and contrary sense that the compound inadvertently conjures by virtue of its phonetic and lexical composition. It is as a consequence of this generation of an unintended and adverse meaning in the reader's mind that the defect of *viruddhamatikṛt* manifests in this verse.–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 731).

xxv *"Vibhavati kriyāya vākya-sāṅga puna viśeṣaṇa —*
Adbhuta-guṇā ei punarātta-dūṣaṇa."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.62)

xxvi Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa, p.497

xxvii *"Viṣāde vismaye harṣe kope dainye'vadhāraṇe,*
Uddeśye pratinirdeśye viṣaye ca prasādane,
Anukramyādike cāpi paunaruktyaṃ na duṣyatīti."–(*Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 792)

xxviii An illustrative example of *uddeśya-pratinirdeśya* is the following verse —

"Na bhajati tapasā klamaḥ klamatvaṃ viṣaya-bhavaṃ na sukhaṃ sukhatvam eti,
Viṣam api ca viṣasya nāśakaṃ syān na hi sadṛśe sadṛśatvam eva nityam."

The meaning of this verse is–the weariness (*klama*) born of austerity (*tapas*) can never be regarded as comparable to the weariness arising from worldly engagement; similarly, worldly pleasure (*viṣaya-sukha*) can never attain the

status of transcendental bliss (*pāramārthika sukha*). Moreover, even poison may on occasion serve as the antidote to another poison–it is therefore not an invariable rule that things of the same kind always share an identity of nature with one another. In this verse, the subjects (*uddeśya*)–such as *klama* and the like–are first identified, and then properties contrary to what might be expected–such as *aklamatva* ("the quality of not being weariness") and so forth–are predicated (*pratinirdiṣṭa*) of them. In instances of this nature, what appears to be repetition (*punarukti*) functions not as a defect but as a positive quality that contributes to the expressive richness of the composition.–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 793).

xxix *"Tina-pāde anuprāsa dekhi anupama,*
Eka-pāde nāhi–ei doṣa bhagnakrama."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.63)

xxx Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa, p.514

xxxi *"Sa ca kāraka-vacana-paryāyādi-kramāṅgāditvena bahudhā bhavati."–(Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 790)*

xxxii An illustrative example of the disruption of sequential order (*bhagnakrama*) with respect to *kāraka* and *vacana* is the following verse —

"Kācid vīṇāṃ murajaṃ aparā kāpi vaṃśīṃ dadhānā kāścit tālaṃ kara-kiśalaye tāla-dhāritvaṃ āptāḥ,
cakruḥ saṅgīta-viracanaṃ rāsa-madhye kayācid gānaṃ nānā-svara-parimalaṃ modam uccair vitene."

The meaning of this verse is–in the midst of the *rāsa* dance, some of the women took up the *vīṇā*, others the *muraja*, and yet others the *vaṃśī*; some, having taken to striking time with their tender hands, attained the quality of time-keepers (*tāla-dhāritva*), and together they created a musical ensemble. Through the singing of one among them–replete with the fragrance of varied musical notes (*nānā-svara-parimalā*)–a profound sense of delight was abundantly diffused all around. In this verse, at the point where *"kayācid"* occurs, a disruption in the *kāraka*–that is, in the grammatical case relation–has taken place; and at the point where *"kāścit"* occurs, a disruption in *vacana*–that is, in grammatical number–has been introduced. It is these two irregularities that constitute instances of *bhagnakrama* with respect to *kāraka* and *vacana* respectively.–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 790).

xxxiii *"Yatra tu ārambha eva kramo nāsti tatra bhagnakrama-doṣo nāsti."–(Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 793)*

xxxiv *"Yadyapi ei śloke āche pañca alaṅkāra,*
Ei pañca doṣe śloka kaila chāra-khāra."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.64)

xxxv “Daśa alaṅkāre yadi eka śloka haya,
Eka doṣe saba alaṅkāra haya kṣaya.
Sundara śarīra yaiche bhūṣaṇe bhūṣita,
Eka śvetakuṣṭhe yaiche karaye bigīta.”*–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.65-66)*

xxxvi *"Pañca alaṅkārera ebe śunaha vicāra,*
Dui śabdālaṅkāra, tina artha-alaṅkāra."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.67)

xxxvii *"Śabdālaṅkāra,–tina pāde āche anuprāsa, … ."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.68)*

xxxviii *"Anuprāsyata ityarthe'nuprāso varṇa-sāmyataḥ.*

Sajātīyaṃ varṇam anu sajātīya-varṇāntaraṃ prakarṣeṇa asyata iti vyutpattiḥ." —(Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 454)

xxxix Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa 10.

xl An illustrative example of *chekānuprāsa* is the following verse —

"Dhāma śyāmam idaṃ śrīdaṃ jagato viratodayam,
Dhyeyaṃ geyaṃ ca sarveṣāṃ dṛśoḥ prema yaśomayam."

The meaning of this verse is–this dark and beautiful abode (*śyāma-dhāma*), which is the source of all splendour and glory for the three worlds and which is ever resplendent, is worthy of meditation (*dhyeya*), worthy of being sung (*geya*), replete with renown (*yaśomaya*), and the very dwelling place of love for all eyes. In this verse, the consonants *"ma"* and *"ya"* each recur only once–the consonant *"ma"* appearing in *"śyāmam"* and *"śrīdam"*, and the consonant *"ya"* appearing in *"dhyeyam"* and *"geyam"*. Since the recurrence of each consonant occurs only a single time and not repeatedly, the variety of *anuprāsa* that has manifested here is *chekānuprāsa* rather than *vṛttyanuprāsa*.–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 455).

xli *"Mādhurya-vyañjakatvena sa eva hy upanāgaraḥ."*

That is to say, when *chekānuprāsa* is realised through consonants that are expressive of the quality of sweetness and grace (*mādhurya*), it is designated as *upanāgarikā vṛtti*. An illustrative example of this is the following verse —

"Anaṅga-maṅgalārambhe sambhedaḥ sveda-kampayoḥ,
Śaṅke paṅkeruha-dṛśo na rasyānanda-mattatā."

The meaning of this verse is–at the very auspicious commencement of Anaṅgadeva's (*kāmadeva's*) activity, when I observe the simultaneous manifestation of perspiration (*sveda*) and trembling (*kampa*) together, I apprehend that this state of joy-intoxication (*ānanda-mattatā*) of the lotus-eyed one may perhaps not yield a pleasing and relishable aesthetic experience (*rasa*). In this verse, the consonants *"ṅa"*, *"ga"*, *"da"* and related sounds each recur once, thereby producing *chekānuprāsa*. Furthermore, since these particular consonants are expressive of and conducive to the quality of *mādhurya*–sweetness and grace–the *chekānuprāsa* manifesting in this verse is to be designated as *upanāgarikā vṛtti*.–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 455).

xlii "Sa ca dvedhā cheka-vṛtti-bhedāt. Ekavārānunyāsena chekaḥ syāt.… ekasyāpy athavānekasyāmreḍitatayā yadi nyāsaḥ syād vṛttyanuprāsaḥ."–(*Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 454).

xliii *"..., Śrī-Lakṣmī-śabde punaruktavadābhāsa.*
Śrī-śabde Lakṣmī-śabde eka vastu ukta,
Punaruktaprāya bhāse, nahe punarukta."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.68,71)

xliv *"Punaruktavadābhāsaḥ punaruktavad eva yaḥ."–(Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 503).*

xlv Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa, p. 607

xlvi *"Ayaṃ śabdārtaniṣṭho'pi bhavati."–(Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 503).*

xlvii For example —

"Tava tanu śarīra-sadṛśīṃ kāñcana kanakasya vīrudhaṃ nekṣe,
Rādhe sumukhi bhavatyā mukha-vad anaṅko'pi śubhrāṃśuḥ."

The meaning of this verse is–O fair-faced Rādhā (*sumukhi Rādhe*)! I have nowhere beheld a golden creeper (*kanaka-vīrudh*) that resembles the slender grace of your form, nor have I anywhere perceived a moon (*sudhāṃśu*) as spotless and unblemished as your countenance. In this verse, the two words *"mukha"* and *"vadana"*–both of which are commonly recognised as synonymous terms for "face"–appear at first glance to have been used in repetition of one another, giving the impression of semantic redundancy. However, upon closer examination, it becomes clear that the correct parsing of the compound is *"mukha-vat anaṅkaḥ"*–meaning "the moon (*anaṅka*) that is like (*vat*) the face (*mukha*)"–rather than a compound formed by the juxtaposition of two synonymous words. With this parsing in view, it becomes evident that no actual repetition has in fact occurred; the words *"mukha"* and *"vadana"* are not being used in the same syntactic position or with the same referential function.*–(Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 503).*

xlviii "Lakṣmīr iva arthālaṅkāra upamā prakāśa, … ."*–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.73)*

xlix *"Yathākatañcit sādharmyam upamā."–(Cf. Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 507)*

l Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa, p. 652

li An illustrative example of *luptopamā* is the following verse —

"Vyūḍhorasko vṛṣaskandhaḥ śālaprāṃśur mahābhujaḥ,

Ātma-karma-kṣamaṃ dehaṃ kṣātro dharma ivāśritaḥ."–[*Raghuvaṃśa* 1.13]

The meaning of this verse is–his (King Dilīpa's) chest was broad and expansive, his shoulders were massive like those of a bull, his arms extended down to his knees, and his stature was as lofty as the *śāla* tree; upon beholding him, one was left with the impression that the very embodiment of the *kṣatriya* code of duty (*kṣātra dharma*), having assumed a physical form fit for the discharge of its own functions, had appeared upon the earth in person.

In this verse, the compound *"vṛṣaskandhaḥ"* is to be resolved as–*"vṛṣasya skandhaḥ iva skandho yasya saḥ"*–meaning "he whose shoulders are like the shoulders of a bull." An examination of this *vigrahavākya*–the expanded or dissolved form of the compound–reveals that the similarity-marker *"iva"* as well as the expression of the *sāmānadharma*–the common property, such as *"balavatva"* ("possessing strength") and the like–have been elided. Similarly, the compound *"śālaprāṃśuḥ"* is to be resolved as–*"śālaḥ iva prāṃśuḥ śālaprāṃśuḥ"*–meaning "one who is as tall as the *śāla* tree." In this instance, only the similarity-marker *"iva"* has been elided, while the remaining elements of the comparison remain intact. Since one or more of the four constituent elements of *upamā* have been omitted in these expressions, they constitute instances of *luptopamā*–the elliptical or incomplete simile.

lii *"Sa (sādṛśya-sambandhaḥ) ca aṃśena na tu sarvair aṃśaiḥ sarvāṃśatvena abhedād upamānopameya-bhāva eva na bhavatīti."–(Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 507)*

liii *"… , Āra arthālaṅkāra āche, nāma virodhābhāsa.*

Īśvara-acintyaśaktye Gaṅgāra prakāśa,

Ihāte virodha nāhi virodha-ābhāsa."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.73,76)

liv *"Jātiś caturbhir jātyādyair guṇo guṇādibhis tribhiḥ.*

Kriyā kriyādravyābhyāṃ yad dravyaṃ dravyeṇa vā mithaḥ,

Viruddham iva bhāseta virodho'sau… ."–(Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa 10.67-68)

lv *"Virodhaḥ sa virodhābhaḥ jātir jātyādibhir guṇaiḥ."–(Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 315)*

lvi An illustrative example of the apparent opposition between *kriyā* and *kriyā*–that is, between action and action–is the following verse —

"Jīvayati ca mūrchayati ca pīnayati ca sūkṣmayaty api ca,
Tava muraḷī-rava-khuralī no jāne kiṃ vijānāti."

The meaning of this verse is–I know not what wondrous knowledge your sharp and piercing flute-sound possesses–at one moment it infuses life and vitality, at another it causes swooning and loss of consciousness, at yet another it renders one expansive and full, and at still another it reduces one to a state of subtle refinement. In this verse, a manifest opposition is apparent between the various *kriyās* or actions described–for the actions of vivifying, causing to swoon, expanding, and rendering subtle are evidently at variance with one another. However, by virtue of the extraordinary and wondrous capacity of the sound of the flute (*veṇu-rava*), all four of these seemingly contradictory actions become possible simultaneously. Consequently, although an apparent contradiction presents itself between the actions, no genuine opposition exists in reality. It is precisely on this ground–that the contradiction is one of appearance rather than of substance–that the ornament of *virodhābhāsa* is held to have manifested in this verse.–(*Karṇapura , Alaṅkārakaustubha*, p. 316)

lvii *"Gaṅgāra mahattva sādhya, sādhana tāhāra —,*
Viṣṇupādotpatti–anumāna alaṅkāra."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.77)

lviii *"Sādhya-sādhana-sadbhāve'numānam anumānavat,*
Anumāne yathā trividho hetus tathātrāpi."–(Karṇapura, Alaṅkārakaustubha, p. 625)

lix *Viśvanātha, Sāhityadarpaṇa 10.63*

lx *"Pratibhā-kavitva tomāra devatā-prasāde,*
Avicāra-kavitve avaśya paṛe doṣa-vāde.
Vicāri kavitva kaile haya su-nirmala,
Sālaṅkāra haile–artha kare jhalamala."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.79,80)

lxi *"Paṛuyā bālaka kaila mora buddhi-lopa,*
Jāni Sarasvatī more kariyāchena kopa.
Ye vyākhyā karila, se manuṣyera nahe śakti,
Nimāira mukhe rahi bole āpane Sarasvatī."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.83,84)

lxii *"Digvijayī yadi parābhave praveśilā,*
Śiṣyagaṇa hāsibāre udyata hailā.
Sabhārei Prabhu karilena nivāraṇa,
Vipra-prati balilena madhura vacana."–(Vṛndāvana Dāsa, Śrī Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata, pṛ. 70)

lxiii *"Śāstrera vicāra bhāla manda nāhi jāni,*
Sarasvatī ye bolāya, bali sei vāṇī."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.88)

lxiv *"Sarasvatī bolena śunaha vipravara!,*
Veda-gopya kahi, ei tomāra gocara.
... yāra ṭhāñi tomāra haila parājaya,
Ananta-brahmāṇḍa-nātha tihoṃ suniścaya."–(Vṛndāvana Dāsa, Śrī Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata, pṛ. 73)

lxv *"Āmi se baliye vipra! tomāra jihvāya,*

Tāhāra sammukhe śakti nā base āmāya.

Āmāra ki dāya Śeṣa-deva Bhagavān,

Sahasra-jihvāya Veda ye kare vyākhyāna."–(Vṛndāvana Dāsa, Śrī Śrī Caitanya Bhāgavata, pṛ. 74)

lxvi *"Sarasvatī svapne tāre upadeśa kaila,*

Sākṣāt Īśvara kari Prabhuke jānila."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.100)

lxvii *"Prāte āsi Prabhu-pade laila śaraṇa,*

Prabhu kṛpā kaila, tāṃra khaṇḍila bandhana.

Bhāgyavanta digvijayī saphala-jīvana,

Vidyābale pāila Mahāprabhura caraṇa."–(Kṛṣṇadāsa Kavirāja Gosvāmī, Śrī Śrī Caitanyacaritāmṛta 1.16.101,102)